

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|

08/407, 064 03/20/95 KATZ

R 6046-101NA

022249
LYON AND LYON LLP
SUITE 4700
633 WEST FIFTH STREET
LOS ANGELES CA 90071-2066

LM02/0706

EXAMINER

WOO, S

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
| 2743 | 22 |

DATE MAILED: 07/06/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 08/407,064 | Applicant(s) Katz |
| | Examiner Stella Woo | Group Art Unit 2743 |

Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 30, 1999

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 26-115 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) 26-33 and 50 is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 34-49 and 51-115 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2743

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 34-39, 46-47, 49, 52, 54-78, 80-83, 87-89, 93-104, 106-110, 114-115 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the publication entitled "Vision by telephone" in view of Hussain (USPN 4,955,052).

The "Vision" publication discloses a system for monitoring a plurality of scrutiny locations from a central station using dial-up telephone facilities in which images from each scrutiny location are sequentially received and displayed along with graphic display data identifying the picture displayed (page 2). When an alarm sensor at a scrutiny location is triggered, the associated camera takes four snap-shots which are stored and transmitted to the called central station for priority display such that the usual surveillance sequence is interrupted (page 2, column 1, paragraph 4). Two-way audio communication can take place via telephones at each remote site and the central station (see figures on pages 2-3).

The "Vision" publication differs from claims 34-39, 46-49, 52, 54-78, 80-83, 87-89, 93-104, 106-110, 114-115 in that it does not explicitly provide for the autodialing operation being under control of a computer. However, as shown by Hussain, it is notoriously well known in a system for monitoring a plurality of remote location from a central station via dial-up telephone

Art Unit: 2743

facilities to use a computer programmed to sequentially call each remote location (note Abstract; col. 8, lines 22-31; col. 12, lines 14-18 and col. 13, line 62 - col. 14, line 29 shows memory in computer storing telephone numbers of remote locations for sequential dialing). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to incorporate such computer control, as taught to be desirable by Hussain, within the monitoring system of the "Vision" publication in order to provide for unmanned monitoring of a plurality of remote locations.

3. Claims 40-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the "Vision by telephone" publication in view of Thompson for the same reasons applied to claims 40-45 in the last Office action and repeated below.

The publication differs from claims 40-45 in that it does not provide for storing display data on scrutiny locations with means for addressing the memory means based on "D" channel type signals. However, Thompson teaches the storage of display data (map, address, name, etc.) corresponding to different scrutiny locations and addressing the data based on ANI information (col. 3, lines 1-53) for the purpose of providing more detailed information with regard to an emergency call. It would have been obvious to incorporate such storage and addressing means within the system described in the publication in order to provide a central monitoring station with more detailed information of a calling scrutiny location in need of emergency help.

4. Claims 48, 51, 90-92, 111-113 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the "Vision by telephone" publication in view of Hussain, and further in view of Thompson for the same reasons applied to claims 40-45 above.

Art Unit: 2743

5. Claims 53, 79, 105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the “Vision by telephone” publication in view of Hussain, and further in view of Fuller et al. (Fuller).

The publication and Hussain combination differs from claims 53, 79, 105 in that it does not specify the selection of sites as being random. However, Fuller teaches the desirability of selecting the video monitoring of remote sites in a random or predetermined fashion (col. 12, lines 11-15) such that it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to incorporate such random selection within the video monitoring system combination of the “Vision” publication and Hussain.

6. Claims 84-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the “Vision by telephone” publication in view of Hussain, and further in view of Guichard et al. (Guichard).

The combination differs from claims 84-86 in that it does not specify remote control of the camera. However, Guichard teaches the well known control of a remote camera (aiming, zoom, focusing, elevation, bearing, etc., col. 5, lines 26-46; col. 6, lines 22-49) over telephone lines such that it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to incorporate such remote camera control within the combination in order to provide the remote user with camera control.

7. Claims 26-33, 50 are allowed.

8. Applicant's arguments filed April 30, 1999 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 40-45, 48, 51, Applicant argues that the “Vision by telephone” publication does not show a “plurality” of switch structures for “providing alert signals indicating

Art Unit: 2743

various alert situations.” The examiner disagrees. The publication provides for a plurality of alarms sensors (first page, third column, third paragraph, third line), each sensor having an associated camera (second page, first column, fourth paragraph) such that different alarm incidents at the different locations can be considered as “various alert situations.”

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Duncan et al. and Bernard et al. show other monitoring systems under central computer control with outbound calling. Braxton and Stockdale show alarm systems which indicate different types of alarm situations.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Art Unit: 2743

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE")

Or:

(703) 305-9508, (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stella Woo whose telephone number is (703) 305-4395 and can normally be reached Monday - Friday, 6:30 a.m. until 11:30 a.m.

Lant
CURTIS A. KUMTZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700

July 1, 1999